## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

GREGORY HANDLOSER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HCL AMERICA, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>19-cv-01242-LHK</u> (VKD)

ORDER SETTING CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS SCHEDULE FOR **HCL'S PRODUCTION OF ESI** 

The parties' April 20, 2020 proposals for a schedule for HCL's production of ESI strongly suggest that very little effort has been made to actually confer regarding a schedule for completion of the production of relevant and responsive ESI. The Court will hold a telephone conference call on Wednesday, April 22, 2020 at 2:30 p.m. to discuss this matter with the parties. Please use the following information to join the call:

> Dial in: (877) 848-7030 **Passcode: 6982082**

Lead counsel for each of the parties must participate in the call. HCL must also have the following participants on the call: (a) the attorney most knowledgeable about HCL's document collection, review, and production (if not lead counsel), and (b) a representative of HCL's ediscovery vendor who can answer specific questions about the collection, processing, and production of HCL's ESI.

The parties should be prepared to discuss, among other things:

- 1. The ESI custodians identified to date.
- 2. For each ESI custodian, the volume of material identified for review after the

## Case 5:19-cv-01242-LHK Document 100 Filed 04/21/20 Page 2 of 2

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25

26

27

28

United States District Court Northern District of California 1

- 3. The rate of review (e.g., per document or per page) and number of reviewers.
- 4. Prioritization of documents/custodians required for class certification.
- 5. Any feasibility analysis conducted by HCL or its vendor concerning the application of particular search terms other search parameters, such as excessive false positives, and if so whether cost-shifting or some other adjustment is warranted.
- 6. Whether the Court should require the use of technology assisted review to expedite HCL's review and production of ESI. See, e.g., Rio Tinto PLC v. Vale S.A., 306 F.R.D. 125 (S.D.N.Y. 2015); <a href="https://www.edrm.net/2019/02/edrm-releases-tar-guidelines/">https://www.edrm.net/2019/02/edrm-releases-tar-guidelines/</a>.

The conference will not be recorded or transcribed by a court reporter.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 21, 2020

Virginia Z. Wash VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI United States Magistrate Judge